DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 619 EA 018 090

AUTHOR Blank, Rolf K.; And Others
TITLE District and School Policies and Management Practices Leading to Effective Secondary Schools: Preliminary Draft for Non-Intensive Sites.
INSTITUTION COSMOS Corp., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 85
CONTRACT 400-83-0060
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985). For a related document, see ED 251 560.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Policy; High Schools; *Organizational Effectiveness; Organizational Theories; Predictor Variables; *School Administration; School Districts; *School Effectiveness; *School Organization; Theory Practice Relationship; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *District Secondary School Study; Excellence in Education; Organizational Excellence

ABSTRACT

Descriptive findings concerning organization and management practices in 16 urban high schools across the United States are reported in this paper. The findings are based on data from the as yet incomplete 3-year District/Secondary School Study. This research effort involved urban comprehensive high schools without special admissions requirements and with significant numbers of students drawn from minority and low income groups. Some schools were examined intensively through interviews, observations, and analysis of records; others participated only in limited interviews. The paper first reviews relevant elements of school effectiveness theory and organizational excellence theory. The researchers sought data on dependent variables reflecting school performance outcomes and independent variables reflecting the presence of characteristics found in the effectiveness and excellence theories. District policies and community characteristics were also considered. This paper reports that the school-related organizational characteristics suggested by the effectiveness and excellence theories are not present in all schools. The research further found that schools varied in the extent to which the district participated directly in school administrative decisions. The relationship between these findings and school performance is not reported because the research is not yet complete, but preliminary analysis suggests that some relationship may be found. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rolf K. Blank

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED265619

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL POLICIES AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES LEADING TO EFFECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS:

Preliminary Draft for Non-Intensive Sites

Rolf K. Blank
Robert K. Yin
J. Lynne White

Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association

April 1985

EA 018 090

COSMOS CORPORATION

1730 K Street, N.W. • Suite 1302 • Washington, D.C. 20006 • (202) 296-6595

PREFACE

This paper represents descriptive findings from 16 schools in the **District/Secondary School Study.** The study, sponsored by the National Institute of Education, began in September 1983 and is due to be concluded in September 1986. A previous paper describing the full methodology and some preliminary findings from two sites are reported in R.K. Yin, R.K. Blank, and J.L. White, "Excellence in Urban High Schools: An Emerging District/School Perspective," COSMOS Corporation, 1984. However, for clarity's sake, large portions of the methodological information are repeated in the present paper.

The paper was prepared with support under Contract No. NIE 400-83-0060, but none of the views expressed herein are to be attributed to the National Institute of Education or its officials.

CONTENTS

PREFACE ii

Section
A. INTRODUCTION 1

B. TESTING TWO THEORIES OF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE:
EFFECTIVENESS THEORY AND EXCELLENCE THEORY 3

School Effectiveness Theory 3
Organizational Excellence Theory 5
Potential Relevance of Theory 5
The School as an Independent Organization 9

C. RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES 11

Within-Site Design 11
Cross-Site Design 11
Definition of "Site" 11
Intensive and Non-Intensive Sites 12
Defining School Operations 14
Defining Contextual Conditions 15

D. DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS ON SCHOOL OPERATIONS 17

Organizational Excellence 17
School Effectiveness 19
District/School Co-Management of Schools 19
Summary 20

REFERENCES 21

TABLE

1. Organizing for Excellence:
Eight Themes and their Illustrative Actions 7

A. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the District/Secondary School Study

Much national attention has been showered on the problem of improving our public schools. Various panel reports, empirical studies, and syntheses of available research have pointed to the conditions desired in our schools, at both the elementary and secondary levels (e.g., Adler, 1982 and 1983a; Boyer, 1983; Education Commission of the States, 1983; Goodlad, 1983; Griesemer and Butler, 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; National Science Board Commission, 1983; Newmann and Behar, 1982; Sizer, 1984; Sleeter, 1982; The College Board, 1983; and Twentieth Century Fund Task Force, 1983).

In spite of this wealth of information and numerous recommendations, specific guidance regarding the initiatives that might be taken by schools or school districts has not necessarily been couched in realistic terms. Many studies, for instance, conclude by recommending actions that may require: new legislation, larger school budgets than are possible, a revamped teaching profession, or homogeneous student body populations--all conditions that may go beyond the constraints of current public school systems. As a more serious shortcoming, the recommendations may be totally unsuited to the conditions of urban high schools--i.e., the types of schools that may be most in need of attention (e.g., see the debate in the November 1983 issue of the Harvard Education Review).

Because of this gap, the present authors have been undertaking a three-year study of urban high schools. This study, known as the **District/Secondary School Study**, began in 1983 and will eventually call for data to be collected from about 45 schools and their districts. Some schools will be the sites of intensive data collection and analysis, whereas other schools will only receive brief visits for data collection. Overall, the study has two major objectives:

- The identification of school management practices, whereby urban high schools can be managed to produce school excellence; and

- The identification of ways in which school district policies, as the larger context within which a school is operated, can facilitate the goals of the school.

Thus, the study is distinctive in its focus on managerial options at both the school and district levels of management--leading to a policy-relevant and not merely theoretically-based study.

The present paper reports on descriptive findings concerning organization and management practices in sixteen urban high schools across the country. These findings are based on interview data with principals and teachers that comprise a portion of the site visits and data collection of the total **District/Secondary School Study.** A previous paper describes the full conceptual framework and design of the study (Yin, Blank, and White, 1984), but pertinent introductory sections of that paper have been repeated here for the sake of clarity.

B. TESTING TWO THEORIES OF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE: EFFECTIVENESS THEORY AND EXCELLENCE THEORY

Because the goal of the **District/Secondary School Study** has been to develop policy-relevant guidelines, the design of the empirical effort focused on the testing of specific theories for managing schools. Two independent bodies of knowledge provided alternative theories that were incorporated into the data collection and analysis efforts: school effectiveness theory (e.g., Cohen, 1982; D'Amico, 1982; Edmonds, 1979; and Purkey and Smith, 1982a and 1982b) and organizational excellence theory (e.g., Peters and Waterman, 1982).

School Effectiveness Theory

School effectiveness theory, in its traditional form, has mainly addressed the operation of elementary schools. This has not been a conscious choice, but is the result of the fact that most of the school effectiveness studies have happened, in hindsight, to have occurred in elementary and not secondary schools. At the elementary level, a common set of findings has been that effective schools have five correlates (see Edmonds, 1979; Brookover, 1981; and the syntheses by Cohen 1981 and 1982 and by Lohman et al., 1982):

- Strong principal leadership;
- A safe school climate conducive to learning;
- An emphasis on basic skills;
- Teachers with high expectations of their students; and
- A system for monitoring and assessing student performance.

Despite the apparent disconnectedness between this traditional posing of school effectiveness theory and the objectives of the **District/-Secondary School Study**, propositions based on school effectiveness theory were considered worth developing because the theory has in fact

reflected concerns over the schooling of urban, disadvantaged students.

In addition and more importantly, investigators (as well as advocates of school effectiveness theory) have gone beyond these simplistic correlates, recognizing that they may only be correlates and that they tend to reflect the simplistic organization of the elementary school. Three developments have in particular made school effectiveness theory potentially more relevant to the problems of the urban high school. First, D'Amico (1982) called attention to the gradual integration of concerns between school effectiveness theory and the "high school reform movement," noting that common problems and strategies could exist.

Second, the U.S. Department of Education, based on work sponsored by the Charles Kettering Foundation, itemized fourteen attributes of effective high schools and used these attributes to select exemplary high schools across the country, as part of the "National Secondary School Recognition Program" (see the description by Cuban, 1984). The fourteen attributes incorporated the five traditional ones (see the first five below) as part of a longer list:

1. The principal as an instructional leader;
2. A safe, orderly school climate;
3. An emphasis on basic skills;
4. Teachers with high expectations for student achievement;
5. A system for monitoring and assessing student performance;
6. The pronouncement of clear academic goals;
7. A sense of teacher efficacy over the conduct of the school;
8. The existence of rewards and incentives for individual teachers and students;
9. The development of community support for the school;

10. Concentration on academic learning time;

11. Emphasis on frequent and monitored homework;

12. A coordinated curriculum;

13. The use of a variety of teaching strategies; and

14. Opportunities for student responsibilities in school affairs.

Third, a causal and policy-relevant framework emerged in the hands of Purkey and Smith (1982), who articulated a three-stage sequence in which:

a. specific school operations (such as those listed above) could be seen to result in changes in

b. a global school culture, which in turn affected

c. scholastic performance.

The three-stage sequence was then used to suggest strategies for federal policies, to be directed at assisting schools with large numbers of disadvantaged students.

Given these developments, the District/Secondary School Study adopted the longer list of fourteen correlates, to determine how these correlates produced school effectiveness. The approach was not one of testing conditions singly, but of searching for the entire pattern of conditions--especially the first five--if school effectiveness theory was to be considered a satisfactory explanation of how best to operate an urban high school to produce excellence.

Organizational Excellence Theory

Potential Relevance of Theory. An entirely independent body of knowledge was represented by the interest in organizational excellence, as depicted mainly in large businesses (Peters and Waterman, 1982). Although this second theory was originally developed to explain exemplary outcomes in private industry, the theory has drawn exceptional

interest among educators, and therefore deserved explicit attention in the District/Secondary School Study.

The business theory identified eight major themes for organizing a firm to produce excellence, with excellence being defined as sustained growth and income, in a given industry, over a twenty-year period of time (see Table 1). At a global level, these eight themes may not appear directly relevant to educational organizations. However, several educators have recently written about the specific parallels between these eight themes and relevant counterparts in schools (e.g., see the whole issue of Educational Leadership, February 1984). One educator, for instance, has noted that "...effective schools and excellent corporations may have more in common than many educators may believe" (Spady, 1983). Moreover, In Search of Excellence describes specific organizational actions within each theme, and closer examination reveals that some of these actions are in fact highly similar to those emerging in studies of school excellence.

For example, Lipsitz (no date) did case studies of four successful schools. Although each school followed a distinctive model, tuned specifically to its own situation and needs (itself a finding), several organizational strategies did appear repeatedly. One was that teachers had more control over their schedules in these schools than in typical schools, that they had common planning periods, and that these conditions bred an ethos of experimentation over new practices. Remarkably, all of these conditions are prominent under various themes in In Search of Excellence. More precisely, for example, the ethos for experimentation is specifically cited as an important organizational action under the theme of "having a bias for action."

As additional parallels, case studies of schools by Grant (1982) and Lightfoot (1983) have mentioned other mimicking characteristics. For instance, Grant's observation about the need to reconstitute schools into smaller units with fewer bureaucratic layers directly reflects the theme of "maintaining simple form, lean staff." Similarly, Lightfoot observed the existence of teacher autonomy of expression, opportunities for organizational participation, and treatment as

Table 1

Organizing for Excellence:
Eight Themes and their Illustrative Actions
(Peters and Waterman, 1982)

A. HAVING A BIAS FOR ACTION

1. Get out of the office
2. Use small groups, for short periods of time, to produce changes (and not voluminous reports)
3. Foster experimentation, rather than extensive market research or planning
4. Foster experimentation in conjunction with lead users
5. De-emphasize paperwork; emphasize one-page memorandum

B. BEING CLOSE TO THE CUSTOMER

1. Assess customer satisfaction frequently (e.g, once a month in a large firm)
2. Discuss and confront client dissatisfaction quickly
3. Define firm as a service business, regardless of actual industry
4. Demonstrate obsession over quality of service to customer
5. Define success in terms of quality, with growth secondary
6. Blame everyone for quality failures; reward individuals for quality successes
7. Define customer service as more important than either technological advance or cost consciousness

C. MAINTAINING AUTONOMY AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

1. Distinguish between creativity and innovation; support innovators; support innovators and pioneers
2. Focus on products, projects, and customers, not technical disciplines
3. Create new divisions in the organization rather than allowing existing ones to grow large
4. Foster an intense and wide variety of communication among employees (creates a competitive marketplace among employees)
5. Tolerate failure

D. SUSTAINING PRODUCTIVITY THROUGH PEOPLE

1. Treat people (employees) as adults; as partners; with dignity
2. View employees as an extended family

3. Use labels that reflect above (e.g., "associate," "crew member," and "cast member," rather than "employee" or "worker")

E. BEING HANDS-ON, VALUE-DRIVEN

1. Have clear values and goals for the organization; most relevant values are qualitative ones, and inspire people at the very bottom of the organization
2. Maintain contact with the real working level of the organization

F. STICKING TO THE KNITTING

1. Keep organization close to the central skill, avoiding great diversification
2. Generate internal and home-grown growth, rather than growth through acquisition
3. Keep any acquisitions and diversifications on a small and experimental scale

G. CREATING SIMPLE FORM, LEAN STAFF

1. Avoid the matrix organization
2. Create divisions that are simple and functional--e.g., according to product
3. Have fewer administrators, more operators; even for large firms there is seldom a need for over 100 persons in the corporate headquarters
4. Maintain a flat organization
5. Keep scale small (small is beautiful)

H. HAVING SIMULTANEOUS LOOSE-TIGHT PROPERTIES

1. Give plenty of rope, but be a stern disciplinarian
2. Have flexible organizational structures, but rigidly shared values dealing with quality, service, innovation, and experimentation
3. Promote autonomy as a product of discipline
4. Balance short- and long-term planning
5. Stay simplistic and simple-minded in spite of the need to specialize

professionals in her cases of "good" high schools--conditions reflecting the two themes of "maintaining autonomy and entrepreneurship" and "sustaining productivity through people."

Overall, the notions in In Search of Excellence: a) provided a comprehensive perspective on how to organize for excellence; b) applied to complex organizations; c) offered specific, action-oriented processes and not just descriptive correlates; and d) were based on empirical evidence from a large number of organizations, though in a different sector. Thus, the propositions drawing from this body of knowledge also were worth incorporating into the **District/Secondary School Study.**

The School as an Independent Organization

Although both theories stipulate somewhat different conditions for producing effective or excellent organizations, both share one common perspective that deserves further discussion--both theories assume the relevant organization to be an independent one.

In other words, neither theory ascribes much of a role to any overhead organizations within which the subject organization may be embedded. For school effectiveness theory, only passing consideration is given to the fact that the school in question may be part of a district. In general, school autonomy is in fact the preferred posture for the effective school, with the hope being that a district can simply play a "supportive" role (e.g., see Purkey and Smith, 1982).

For organizational excellence theory, the same elements are missing, even in the business sense. No mention is made of the board of directors of a corporation or even of the shareholders. Instead, the chief executive officer (CEO) is assumed to be an autonomous agent, operating independently of any external constraints other than those possibly posed by clients.

This missing element, in both theories, was not sufficiently appreciated in the initial design of the **District/Secondary School Study.** Even though the study was explicitly intended to address both "district" and "school" practices, the investigators believed they

would identify school-based operations that produced effectiveness or excellence, and that they would then infer the appropriate district posture as part of the supportive context for the school's operations (a contextual perspective). At the time, the major concern was to avoid converting the study into a "district" study (a district perspective), as previously noted, and so most of the literature on district management (e.g., see Cuban, 1984) was ignored. In hindsight, the decision to avoid the district perspective was a correct one. However, none of the investigators anticipated the incorrectness of the contextual perspective and the eventual need for yet a third approach, to be described later, that might be considered a perspective in which the school and the district "co-manage" the school.

C. RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The research design for the **District/Secondary School Study** called for a description of the data to be collected within a site as well as a site selection plan. These two considerations may be thought of as covering within-site and cross-site issues, and each is the topic of the present section of this paper.

Within-Site Design

The within-site design covered the outcomes of school performance (dependent variables) and the school operations hypothesized to lead to such performance (independent variables). In general, the dependent variables reflected the appropriate definition of an excellent (or effective) urban high school, and the independent variables reflected the characteristics of school operations contained in the two theories--school effectiveness theory and organizational excellence theory--described earlier. In addition, a set of contextual variables, covering conditions external to the school, also were defined.

Cross-Site Design

Definition of "Site." Because the goal of the study was to determine how urban high schools can excel, the basic unit of analysis was the secondary or high school, defined as:

- A school in which students graduate from the twelfth grade, regardless of the starting grade of the school.

Such schools had to be comprehensive in scope (e.g., not vocational schools). In addition, to assure that the results of the study could address the needs of the common urban high school in the U.S. today, three other criteria were used for defining eligible sites: a) the school could not have any admissions requirements based on special tests, b) the school had to have a minority enrollment of at least 30 percent, and c) the school had to have a low-income enrollment of at

least 30 percent. These criteria were purposely selected to direct the **District/Secondary School Study** to the needs of the public education of urban, disadvantaged students.

To qualify as urban schools, the schools had to be part of school districts located in:

- Urban areas of 100,000 persons or more, with densities of at least 1,000 persons per square mile.

This definition of eligible urban areas happened to match a specific set of cities enumerated in the 1980 census, and these 161 urban locations were used as the universe for study.

A final set of criteria for defining eligible sites had to do with regional and city size characteristics. The final pool of sites to be included in the **District/Secondary School Study** had to cover five regions of the country: Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, Southwest, and West. The use of such strata helped to reinforce the national orientation of the study. The non-intensive sites were selected according to four strata of city size.

Intensive and Non-Intensive Sites. Any study, covering the scope of issues described to this point, faces the stereotypic dilemma of allocating resources to a small number of intensive case studies versus extending these resources to a larger number of sites to be covered more superficially. This tradeoff is created by the complexity of events within a single site, and the fact that a wide variety of information may be relevant at any given site.

In the **District/Secondary School Study**, an attempt was made to mediate this tradeoff by having both types of sites, which were in turn labeled Intensive Sites and Non-Intensive Sites. Intensive Sites were deemed the subject of case studies--calling for interviews, direct observations, and analysis of records and documents (e.g., see Yin, 1984). Such use of multiple sources of evidence allowed the investigators to pursue a corroboratory path, in which the details of school performance or operation were based on the convergence of

information from several sources, and not just a single one. To conserve resources, four such Intensive Sites were to be selected, with each one having two waves of data collection over two academic years.

Because only four such sites could be accommodated, the research design called for all of these sites to have achieved exemplary levels of school performance. Sites were to be screened so that, before a final selection was made, an eligible Intensive Site had to:

- Be ranked in the top 25 percent, compared to the median of scholastic attainment and attendance, in the entire pool of 296 schools in the Ford Foundation City High School Recognition Program (which used the same eligibility criteria as the present study);
- Be recognized by the local community as an exemplary school, as reflected for instance by coverage in the mass media; and
- Show evidence of sustained exemplary performance over a period of at least three years.

In contrast, the Non-Intensive Sites were deemed to be the subject of data collection by face-to-face interview only, and only with a few key officials. Readily available school records also were to be collected, mainly to assess the school performance variables, but no attempt was made to establish a convergence of evidence, and the scope of inquiry was narrower than at the Intensive Sites. Given the available resources, 40 such Non-Intensive sites were incorporated into the final study, and these were further divided into two types:

- Non-Intensive Site Type A was to be a pool of four pairs of sites (N=8). Each pair was to contain schools in the same district, one of which was known to have achieved exemplary performance and the other of which was known to have produced only minimal performance; and
- Non-Intensive Site Type B was to be a set of schools (N=32), selected through a cluster sampling method and whose performance

levels were therefore not known beforehand, but which represented the original pool of eligible sites in the 161 cities. (In this pool, any given school district could have up to two such sites.)

In sum, the rationale underlying the identification of Intensive Sites and Non-Intensive Sites was to allow for full proposition testing (the four Intensive Sites and the eight, Type A Non-Intensive Sites) as well as for some assessment of the prevalence or frequency of the pertinent school outcomes and school operations (the thirty-two, Type B Non-Intensive Sites).

The present paper reviews data on the prevalence of school operations in sixteen Type B Non-Intensive Sites which were visited between October and December 1984.

Defining School Operations. The definition of the relevant variables for school operations began with two lists: the fourteen attributes from school effectiveness theory and the eight themes from organizational excellence theory. Each list was converted into a set of measures addressing two concerns: 1) the existence of the predicted operation, and 2) the determination of how the operation appeared to causally produce the desirable performance outcomes.

The fourteen attributes from effectiveness theory were readily incorporated into the study's instruments, because the attributes already were defined in terms of school operations. In the case of the organizational excellence themes, however, some adaptation was needed because these themes were originally framed in terms of business, and not school organizations. For each theme, the ideas from In Search of Excellence (see Table 1) were therefore converted into school-based propositions. To develop the interview protocol, items that measure existence of specific practices were written for each proposition.

In each non-intensive site (a school), five staff were asked to respond--principal, two department heads (mathematics and English), and two teachers. The staff responses for the items indicate the extent to which the principal "has a bias for action." The aggregated responses from all the non-intensive sites provide a measure of the prevalence of

this organizational excellence theme in urban high schools.

Using the approach outlined above, the excellence themes and school effectiveness attributes were expressed as items in the interview protocol. Several of the themes and attributes had overlapping propositions and the same items could be used to test both, e.g., "sticking to the knitting" and "basic skills emphasis." However, due to the time constraints of an interview during the school day (50 minutes per person), several of the attributes and one theme could not be tested in the non-intensive sites. Those which were most difficult to express in short-answer questions were not included, such as "safe, orderly climate" and "well-coordinated curriculum."

Defining Contextual Conditions. Two kinds of contextual conditions were considered important to the way in which urban high schools operate--district policies and community characteristics. District policies were viewed as conditions external to the school organization in the original conceptualization of the study. However, district policies were of direct concern to the study. The relevant items were limited to two categories:

1. Those policies and procedures that appear to affect the school operations; and

2. Those policies that appear to affect the outcomes of school performance directly, without necessarily affecting school performance.

Examples of the first category were district policies or procedures that might expand or limit the range of a school's options for "having a bias for action" or "being close to the customer," etc. Thus, information about the school's testing program would be enhanced by inquiries about district policies and procedures regarding testing programs. An example of the second category would be where the district had redefined a school's boundaries. If the composition of the resulting student population had changed, district policies and procedures might have directly affected school outcomes.

Regardless of which of these two categories is involved, a major proposition at the outset of the **District/Secondary School Study** had to do with school autonomy. The proposition, drawing equally from school effectiveness and organizational excellence theories, was that:

- Excellent urban high schools may very well be those where district policies and procedures are minimal or rarely enforced.

The intensive site protocol and the non-intensive instrument both included items to determine whether school autonomy had led to positive school outcomes. The non-intensive instrument included several items designed to measure the role of district policies and procedures in school decisionmaking, management, and operations. These items included:

1. An indication of who is most involved in making decisions in: school goals, departmental spending, hiring faculty, curriculum design, etc. (among district, principal, department head, assistant principal, teachers, students);
2. The amount of staff development time decided by the school or district;
3. The frequency of teacher evaluation was based on school or district policy; and
4. Whether requirements for grade promotion have been determined by the district, school, or department.

The interview responses to these items indicate the level of district involvement in school operations. Two district administrators were interviewed for each of the non-intensive site locations to add information on the district role.

D. DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS ON SCHOOL OPERATIONS

The information collected in the 16 urban high schools can be used to make some initial statements concerning the prevalence, or frequency, of those school organization and management practices predicted by the organizational excellence and school effectiveness theories. Then, the proposition concerning school autonomy is examined in light of the data on district policies and procedures; a co-management model, in which both the school and the district "administer" the school, is discussed as a new alternative supported by the preliminary findings.

These initial findings are based on individual interview responses from principals and teachers in the selected schools. The study analysis design calls for the individual responses to be aggregated by school to create school-level measures. These school-level operations measures, including the district role, are then to be analyzed with performance measures. However, at this point in the data collection process, this latter analysis is premature, and is therefore not reported here.

Organizational Excellence

The organizational excellence theory, based on themes from In Search of Excellence, can be examined for its usefulness in explaining urban high school operations with the initial descriptive data. The data from the interviews show a mixed pattern of prevalence of the excellence themes and predicted school operations. This mixed pattern suggests that the practices may indeed be related to variations in outcomes, which will not be examined until the data have been collected from all 32 sites. The variations for seven of the eight excellence themes were as follows (no items were included to cover the eighth theme, "creating simple form, lean staff"):

- Principals in these schools vary in the extent to which they "have a bias for action." For instance, one-third spend over 75 percent of their time outside of their office; however, another one-third spends less than 40 percent of their time in this manner.

- Some schools are "being close to the customer," in that the majority use standardized or curriculum-based test results for student feedback, teacher planning, and school goals, but a large proportion of schools makes no such attempts; furthermore, only half of the schools require counselors to keep records of meeting with students individually (indicating no consistent policy on regular sessions).

- The schools are mixed in the degree to which they preserve "autonomy and entrepreneurship." For example, there are wide variations in amount of time allotted for informal interactions among teachers.

- The schools show mixed efforts in "sustaining productivity through people." For example, the amount of staff development time varied greatly, from zero to five times per year (about 40 percent) to more than ten times per year (about 20 percent).

- The principals vary in the extent to which they operate in a "hands-on, value-driven" way, as demonstrated by the fact that one-third observe 20-100 teachers in their classrooms per month, but another one-third only observe 0-6 teachers per month.

- The schools vary in their "sticking to the knitting," as one-third of the schools require less than 65 percent of the credits for graduation in required core curriculum areas.

- The schools do not have a clear pattern of management decisions that indicate "simultaneous, loose-tight properties," with regard to such decisions as: hiring faculty, setting student behavior rules, and designing and changing the curriculum.

School Effectiveness

The interview items in the protocol for non-intensive sites addressed only seven of the fourteen attributes of school effectiveness. A similar variation was found in the prevalence of these practices, thus also leaving open the possibility of significant relationships between these practices and performance measures. Examples of the findings are:

- The schools were mixed in showing the "principal as instructional leader," as shown by the previously noted variation in teacher and classroom observations, and by the fact that about 40 percent reported no curriculum or instructional innovation initiated by the principal.
- Most schools (14 of 16) use a "system for monitoring student performance," as indicated by standardized tests, but only one-half of the schools use some curriculum-based testing.
- "Teacher efficacy" was found to vary among the teachers interviewed. For example, about 70 percent could name a school curriculum or instructional practice that was initiated by a teacher over the last year, but 30 percent could not name such a practice.
- A majority of the schools have "rewards and incentives for teachers," reflected by specific school awards or recognition. However, one-third indicated no such rewards or incentives.
- The schools have emphasized "increasing academic learning time" with over 80 percent of respondents reporting some new practice or effort within the last two years.

School/District Co-Management of Schools

The mixed results, for both the effectiveness and excellence theories, were complemented by trends potentially supporting a "co-management" model of school administration. This model had been suggested by earlier work in two intensive case studies (see Yin, Blank, and White, 1984), and is an aspect of school management

overlooked by both theories.

For the results from the 16 sites being reported in the present paper, evidence of co-management came from responses to: a) questions about who participated in various types of decisionmaking, and b) questions about the source of various rules and regulations governing school operations. For decisionmaking, the schools dominated on only two aspects (departmental spending, and teacher scheduling and assignments). For six other types of decisions, the results were a mixture of school and district participation (setting schoolwide goals, hiring faculty, designing and changing the curriculum, setting rules for student behavior, deciding about teacher evaluations, and setting rules for staff development). This mixed pattern suggests that there may again be some relationship between the degree of co-management and the measures of school performance.

As for the sources of various rules and regulations, only three were mixed (the giving of teacher awards, the selection of any curriculum-based test(s) to be used, and the setting of frequencies for counselor-student meetings). All the other rules and regulations were overwhelmingly either set by the school or the district, and these factors are therefore unlikely to be related to the performance measures.

Summary

These preliminary findings from data collected from 16 non-intensive school sites generally corroborate information collected earlier from two intensively studied schools. The data collection for the non-intensive sites is still only half completed, but the prevalence of practices suggests sufficient variance that effectiveness, excellence, or co-management factors may be significantly related to school performance measures.

The data reported in the present paper, however, only examined the prevalence of practices among the 16 non-tensive sites. Thus, no attempt was made to correlate these practices with any performance measures. The latter analysis will be done when data have been collected from all 32 non-intensive sites.

REFERENCES

Adler, Mortimer J., Paideia Problems and Possibilities, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1983a.

_____, The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1982.

Boyer, Ernest, High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America, Harper and Row, New York, 1983.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Effective Secondary Schools, Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1981.

Cohen, Michael, "Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings," American Education, January/February 1982, 18:13-16.

_____, "Effective Schools: What the Research Says," Today's Education, April/May 1981.

Cuban, Larry, "Transforming the Frog into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy, and Practice at the District Level," Harvard Educational Review, May 1984, 54:129-151.

D'Amico, Joseph, The Effective Schools Movement: Studies, Issues, and Approaches, Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October 1982.

Duckworth, K., Linking Educational Policy and Management with Student Achievement, Center for Educational Policy and Management, 1980.

Edmonds, Ronald, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, October 1979, 37:15-24

Education Commission of the States, A Summary of Major Reports on Education, Denver, Colorado, November 1983.

Goodlad, John, A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1983.

Grant, Gerald, Education, Character, and American Schools: Are Effective Schools Good Enough? Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, September 1982.

Griesemer, J. Lynn, and Cornelius Butler, Education Under Study: An Analysis of Recent Major Reports on Education, Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc., Chelmsford, Massachusetts, September 1983.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence, The Good High School, Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1983.

Lipsitz, Joan, "Successful Schools for Young Adolescents: A Summary," The Center for Early Adolescence, Carrboro, North Carolina, n.d.

Lohman, Ernest E. et al., Effective Schooling in a Rural Context: A New Hampshire View, New Hampshire State Department of Education, Concord, New Hampshire, 1982.

National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington, D.C., April 1983.

National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, Educating Americans for the 21st Century, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., September 1983.

Newmann, Fred, and Steven Behar, The Study and Improvement of American High Schools: A Portrait of Work in Progress, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison, Wisconsin, October 1982.

Peters, Thomas J., and Robert H. Waterman, Jr., In Search of Excellence, Harper and Row, New York, 1982.

Purkey, Stewart, and Marshall Smith, Effective Schools - A Review, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison, Wisconsin, June 1982a.

Sizer, Theodore, Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1984.

Sleeter, Christine E., Research in the 1980s on Secondary Education: A Review and a Projection, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison, Wisconsin, February 1982.

Spady, William, "Lessons for Educational Executives from America's Best-Run Companies," Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California, May 1983.

The College Board, Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able To Do, Educational Equality Project, The College Board, New York, 1983.

Twentieth Century Fund Task Force, Making The Grade, Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1983.

Yin, Robert K., Case Study Research: Design and Methods, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California, 1984.

_____, Rolf K. Blank, and J. Lynne White, "Excellence in Urban High Schools: An Emerging District/School Perspective," COSMOS Corporation, Washington, D.C., December 1984.